Wisconsin Enterprise Architecture Team (WEAT)
April 18, 8:30 – Noon, DOA Building, Yahara (122) Conference Room

Invited Attendees:

WEAT Voting Members

- Doug Bingenheimer, (Team Leader/Chief Enterprise Architect - DET) - Facilitator
- Keith Hazelton (UW representative)
- Bud Borja (Milwaukee Co., local government representative)
- Mickey Crittenden (Rock Co., local government representative)

- Jay Jaeger (DOT, large state agency representative)
- Diane Kohn (DWD, large state agency representative)
- Rich Hamann (DNR, small agency rep, Apps rep)
- Paul Hedges (WHS, small agency rep)

DET Representatives

- Allen Poppe (DET Development Representative)
- Erik Mickelson (Enterprise Process Integration)
- Dave Mockert (Technical Architect)
- Michelle McCall (Note taker)

Agenda

#	Time	Item	Presenter	Item Description	Discussion	Action Item(s)	Responsible Person	Due Date
1		Meeting times	Doug	Based on other meetings, the time for WEAT needs to change.	WEAT's regular meeting time and date have been changed from the morning on the first and third Tuesday of the month, to **2:00 – 5:00 PM** on the **first and third Monday of the month.**			
2		Minutes approval	Doug		The remote access conversation isn't complete and Jay will revisit the subject with Kevin. Reflecting on Matt's comments from last meeting, WEAT is in a state of change and has clearly set out their vision of how that evolution will take place. Resources levels are an issue that they are concerned about, as is the trust between the agencies and DET.	Publish the minutes as distributed.		
3		Develop a Proposal for Matt	Doug	Structure for discussion	Doug said the discussion will center on developing a framework for a proposal to give to Matt. The group set ground rules and a framework for the discussion: - Discussions to be collaborative for everyone - For the sake of discussion, assume that WEAT owns the process and has an impact on how this will go from now on. - Identify if there are certain tasks that WEAT already does, what ELSE does WEAT want to do as WEAT to			

#	Time	Item	Presenter	Item Description	Discussion	Action Item(s)	Responsible Person	Due Date
					have an impact			
		Discussion - part 1		Define the "what"	**1.** Develop a proposal for IT governance that includes structure, roles and responsibilities and a method for obtaining critical resources (partnering). **2.** Recommend strategic directions for technical use, with a means of establishing priority and doing the GAP analysis (both governance and architecture) to determine how to deal with the multiple strategies. (Need for inventory of systems.) **3.** Vision: An IT ecosystem that supports sustained, disciplined planning, deployment and ongoing support for technical evolution across the enterprise/extended enterprise. Problem statement: This vision has not been realized. As important as it is, SIS is not a substitute for such a vision. WEAT should propose how to move toward the vision. **4.** WEAT needs to identify the value it expects to bring. The fact that there aren't enough resources is a symptom of the fact that people don't value the expertise that WEAT brings. If WEAT can show people the value of the team and its ideals, then the buy-in comes with that along with the resources and the technology. WEAT also needs to find a way to delegate and filter. Example: SIS documents. Give enough information and structure to those WEAT delegates to so that they can do work, like standards work, and then WEAT would simply review the material and provide course corrections. **5.** WEAT needs to define how shared technical interests are recognized and acted upon through a community oriented process that: provides for effective agency involvement, clarifies the role of the CIO, allows for delegation, supports a consistent informing of the governor's office the legislature and state and local agency leadership			

#	Time	Item	Presenter	Item Description	Discussion	Action Item(s)	Responsible Person	Due Date
					with respect to IT in the State of Wisconsin. **6.** Identify how to better guide the IT architecture, direction and governance. Create the centers of excellence to help in the implementation. **7**. Relevant today AND tomorrow. If WEAT is not relevant to the business need every single day, there won't be buy-in. WEAT needs to be willing to make mistakes and be responsive to the shifts of things as life moves on. Consistently build step-by-step, rather than have the "tear it down and start over if it doesn't work." Try to create a collective of like minds. WEAT cannot be viewed as a barrier. The reality is that SIS is here. WEAT needs to deal with that as well as its immediate needs, and the problem lies in how WEAT does both. **8.** WEAT needs to take the high level visions strategies and goals and break them down in to deliverable, actionable items. Trust is an issue, and they have talked about that. WEAT has not proven that it can deliver, so it needs to start doing that. They've asked people to believe in them too many times. WEAT needs to help the agencies in finding creative ways of finding resources and solving problems. As WEAT looks to put into place the things they'd like to accomplish next year, WEAT needs to know the resources that are available and they never seem to have access to that information. They also need to clearly identify their constraints and assumptions as well. **9.** The roles and responsibilities for an enterprise governance organization and how WEAT is going to sustain it need to be redefined and published. WEAT needs to identify the time, money, resources and authority needed to execute the plan. **10.** The degree to which WEAT			

#	Time	Item	Presenter	Item Description	Discussion	Action Item(s)	Responsible Person	Due Date
					needs to have cognizance around vision, but having strategy and deliverables. WEAT has certain responsibilities they have to carry out, but WEAT has the prerogative to do things that WEAT needs to do to take it into the future. They have challenge of synthesizing all of this into a document that shows the vision and deliverables as well as the value proposition. That will give WEAT the most bang for their buck. If they don't get hung up around the reality of the need for GAP analysis around governance, infrastructure and business applications, they can reveal great opportunity.			
				Define the deliverable	Once a proposal is written, WEAT is concerned about its approval and acceptance throughout DET. Will WEAT be allowed to follow the proposal? How does WEAT obtain "buy-in" from operations? Suggestions - Build the relationship into the process so that these discussions are a part of the everyday conversation. - Identify the stakeholders who might also need to approve the proposal. - Demonstrate that WEAT has produced actual deliverables of value at this point in order to garner support for these changes. - Identify what WEAT has done that says that WEAT has been successful The team talked about changing the way WEAT deals with SIS. Suggested getting the DET SIS folks at the WEAT meeting. Judy had a commitment to attend the meetings, Max, Kevin, etc need to be involved in WEAT. The group suggested taking this issue up with Matt.			
				Proposal	WEAT needs to talk to its stakeholders about what the end			

Content Contacts: DOA/DET Enterprise Architects
Doug Bingenheimer, Doug.Bingenheimer@Wisconsin.gov, 608-264-7892
Tekla Wlodarczyk, Tekla.Wlodarczyk@Wisconsin.gov, 608-266-5054

Page 4 of 7

#	Time	Item	Presenter	Item Description	Discussion	Action Item(s)	Responsible Person	Due Date
					vision is. In order to get buy-in, WEAT should develop a background document that says here's where they've been, here's what they are trying to do, and then go talk to them. WEAT needs to develop a background document that has a value proposition.			
				Challenges	- Election changes: need win over the leadership that lives. Matt has said he want an organization that will withstand transition. - Stakeholder input and the timing of this input must be considered, perhaps as a time box.			
				Positive development	- Legislature is moving in the right direction - The budget office is also now responsible for technology.			
				Next Steps	Assigned tasks to team members.	Governance proposal components: What, how, where, when, and why?		28-Apr
						1) Write up the list of collective inputs - synthesize the charts	Rich - Doug to review	28-Apr
						2) Background/ Legacy document Governance Domains and WEAT	Jay and Diane	28-Apr
						3) Challenges / issues / barriers to be addressed	Paul	28-Apr
						4) Value proposition - business case to support the proposal	Keith will start	28-Apr
						5) Straw-man of scope	Mickey	28-Apr
						6) Straw-man model of what and how	Doug/Eric/Allen/ Bud	28-Apr
		DET Architecture Team	Dave Mockert		Dave handed out a Relationship/Meeting document from			

#	Time	Item	Presenter	Item Description	Discussion	Action Item(s)	Responsible Person	Due Date
					DET the shows some of the relationship issues between WEAT and DET Technical Architecture team. The focus of the technical architecture team will be the architecture issues that come from the solutions group and to resolve them quickly. The team will take the larger issues to WEAT. Decisions that come out of WEAT will be communicated to the organization. Any input that WEAT has in the process will be helpful. Dave said the biggest challenge that the technical architecture team will have is that they will want to continue to do things the way DET has always done it. It is his mission to try to keep them from doing that as it is critical to the process to be willing to change course. The team talked about logging the small decisions even if there is not a presentation to WEAT so they can be tracked and communicated. The team and Dave talked about how WEAT and the Technical Architecture Team should work together, where/how decisions should be made, and identified lines of communication and input. A question was raised on how many versions of software will be strategic. It was mentioned that a document came out of SIS that outlined the principle that there would be approximately 2 versions of each that were considered strategic. The team questioned what the roles of the Customer Service Managers and the Service Delivery Coordinators will be. The team suggested forming a tech task team with Judy's group.			
		Closing comments	Doug		CIO council. Here is the website: www.corporateexecutiveboard.com			

#	Time	Item	Presenter	Item Description	Discussion	Action Item(s)	Responsible Person	Due Date
					The team also mentioned that the agenda should have more clarity about what the meeting is about so it can be more useful.			

Items To Bring To CIO

Item	Description	Next Steps	Responsible Party	Due Date
Involvement of "SIS" folks in WEAT Meeting	Judy Heil, Kevin Acker, Max Babler		Doug Bingenheimer	